



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/571,299

03/10/2006

Andreas Hahn

2058.092US1

6243

50400

7590

09/18/2008

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

BEYEN, ZEWDU A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4144

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/571,299	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAHN, ANDREAS	
	<b>Examiner</b> ZEWDU BEYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 4144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/10/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/10/2006</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined and are pending

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 submitted 03/10/3006, is attached to the instant Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The statement "The router being set up to only route addresses within the shared access address range" is an indefinite statement because routers do not route addresses.

**NOTE:** For the purpose of **only completing a first action on the merit** the examiner considered, the statement "The router being set up to only route addresses within the shared access address range" as, the router being set up to only ROUTE PACKETS BASED ON ADDRESSES WITHIN THE SHARED ACCESS ADDRESS RANGE.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 4144

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. claims 1, 2, 3,4,9,10,11,12,14,15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art 'AAPA' (fig.1), and in view **Furukawa** (US20060036768).

**Regarding claims 1, 9, 14, 15, and 16**, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system comprising: a plurality of client hardware elements forming a computer network (fig.1 cloud .114); a server network segment comprising a plurality of service (fig.1, cloud 112); and a router for interconnecting the computer network with the server network segment (fig.1

Art Unit: 4144

box.116); the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.x.x.x),

and the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x) is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range ), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number) and the router being set up to only route addresses within the shared access address range (fig.1 discloses a router with access list that allow communication only between the listed addresses).

'AAPA' silent on, the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Furukawa teaches the server network segment/"external area of an IP network" being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range (fig.18, paragraph 102, discloses the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range and the non-private address communication range).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range, as suggested by Furukawa. This modification would benefit the system by providing additional security since the private addresses are not known to the external environment.

**Regarding claims 2, and 10,** 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

**Regarding claims 3, and 11,** 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the server network segment is a LAN server (fig.1 shows a LAN server).

**Regarding claims 4, and 12,** 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the computer network is a Local Area Network LAN or a Wide Area Network WAN (fig.1 a Local Area computer Network).

**Regarding claim 6,** 'AAPA' discloses a router for interconnecting a server network segment comprising a plurality of services with a computer network (fig.1, box.116)  
the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1,

Art Unit: 4144

IP-range 10.x.x.x),

and the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x) is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range (fig. 1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range ), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number) and the router being set up to only route addresses within the shared access address range (fig.1 discloses a router with access list that allow communication only between the listed addresses).

‘AAPA’ silent on, the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Furukawa teaches the server network segment/“external area of an IP network” being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range (fig.18, paragraph 102, discloses the addresses are subdivided into both the private address communication range and the non-private address communication range).

Art Unit: 4144

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the applicant admitted prior art by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range, as suggested by Furukawa, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claims 1 and 9 above.

**Regarding claim 7**, 'AAPA' teaches a router according to claim 6, the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

**7. Claims 5, 8 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'AAPA', and Furukawa as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, in further in view of Lakshman et al. to **(US5951651)**.

**Regarding claim 5**, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on, a computer network system according to claim.1, wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the



Art Unit: 4144

third access address range (fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by Lakshman. This modification would benefit the system by providing a fast destination or source address check up to facilitate a speedy communication.

**Regarding claim 8**, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on a router according to claim 6, the router comprising a filter which is set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass

Art Unit: 4144

addresses from the third access address range as suggested by, Lakshman, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

**Regarding claim 13**, the combination of AAPA-Furukawa silent on a method according to claim 11, further comprising the step of setting up a filter in the router in such a manner that the filter blocks addresses from the second access address range(s) and passes addresses from the third access address range(s).

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination of AAPA-Furukawa by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by Lakshman, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and not an extension of monopoly. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of this application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZEWDU BEYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-7157. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00am-6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Taghi Arian can be reached on (571) 272-3787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 4144

/ZEWDU BEYEN/

Examiner, Art Unit 4144

/Taghi T. Arani/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4144